HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XIV, No. 1 Saturday, January 5, 1957 Washington, D. C.

News Section *Printed in Two Sections*

Birth Pangs of a Doctrine: Headlines in the press obscured the fact that, during the past week as outlines of the President's plan for Mideast action became known, far more opposition to the "doctrine" developed than leaders of either party would publicly admit.

Privately, Democratic Senate Leader Lyndon Johnson compared it unfavorably with the Truman Doctrine of 1947 which pledged our aid to Greece and Turkey. Those countries, it was pointed out, asked our help. Today, the Arab countries spurn it.

Chairman Gordon (D.-Ill.) of the House Foreign Affairs Committee branded the proposed policy as "an undated declaration of war."

Conservative Republicans in private talked of it critically as a demand for a "blank check." They thought it too bad that Ike had let his advisors talk him into requesting from Congress the same kind of a blank check in foreign policy for which Republican members in opposition had criticized the regimes of Roosevelt and Truman. And especially Republicans, smarting under word of a rise in spending in a $72 billion budget, found the Administration proposal for economic aid "just more of the same old giveaway" and no likely solution of the difficulties of the Near East. And why did the Administration leak the idea out to the press before consulting Congress?

On the first day of Congress a storm on the Hill was gathering, despite the optimistic headline writers.

Then Dulles went before Congressional committees and sought to answer the sharply probing questions. HUMAN EVENTS learns what he said in these private sessions. The gist of his discourse — we understand — was something different from the accounts of the press based on reports of what the plan would be. Congressmen had been ridiculing the doctrine as one we sought to cram down the throats of unwilling Arab countries that we thought would be the victims of Soviet invasion. But as Dulles told the story, the aim of the announcement of the doctrine was less to impress the Arabs — Egypt, Jordan, Syria, etc. — than to reassure other Mideastern states — Turkey, Iran, Iraq and Pakistan — which are much closer to the Soviet Union. They are anxious to know that we are pledged to help them if Russia should invade their territories.

About the same time, Constantine Brown, well informed foreign editor of the Washington *Star*, reported that actually the biggest impetus to formation of the doctrine was Iran's concern about Soviet military concentrations near her borders. Iran wanted promise of military help.

And when Dulles, queried on the point by members of committees, reassured them that no land forces would be sent, leaving the implication that U.S. military aid would be solely by the Air Force, many Congressional faces thawed.

But whose was the fault — it was asked — for risking Congressional opposition by such clumsy methods of releasing the outlines of the policy?

Administration sources say the British leaked the story to an American correspondent who gave an incorrect picture of the whole doctrine. The British Foreign Office, apparently, still is jealous of its traditional position in the Middle East and dislikes the primary role which the Eisenhower Doctrine would give to the U.S.

However that may be, the committees — as the echoes of Ike's words die down — are preparing to go into the whole scheme thoroughly in the regular Congressional process before the Congress will make its decisions. Congress wants to know more about it all.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hugger Mugger Over Senate Organization: The discussion during the past two months, in the press and on the radio, over which party would take over and organize the Senate ended this week when the Democrats, with sufficient votes, did just that thing. The election had left the Democrats with 49 and the Republicans with 47 Senators. But there seemed uncertainty as to what Democratic Senator Lausche would do and whether Senator-elect Javits could extricate himself from the Attorney General's position in Albany in time for organization. However, only a few in Washington know the behind-the-scenes story of how, by a comedy of errors, the GOP leadership thought they had a chance in an eleventh-hour incident just before the Senate began to vote.

In the midst of the confusion of the opening of Congress, GOP leaders received a report from sources in Columbus, Ohio, hitherto reliable, that Lausche was resigning his Governorship to go to Washington to vote at the opening and that his intention was to vote with the Republicans. The news sent Senate GOP leaders into a highly excited huddle with Vice President Nixon. They decided that, if the report turned out to be true, it would be necessary to get Senator-elect Javits to resign his Attorney Generalship and be sworn in as Senator. They sent word to the White House to exert influence on Javits to do so.

The White House, anxious to do anything to bring about Republican control of the Senate, arranged for Javits to come down to Washington and to remain hidden away in an office under the Capitol Dome near the Senate floor. If Lausche should definitely indicate his adhesion to GOP control, then Nixon as Vice President would receive Javits, read his signed resignation as Attorney General of New York and then swear him in as Senator. With the resultant score, 48 to 48, Nixon would cast the deciding vote for GOP control.

Unfortunately for the plan, Lausche on arrival in the Capital made no commitment, and on the vote for the election of the President pro-tem of the Senate, the Ohioan broke his colors by voting with the Democrats for Senator Hayden, the Democratic candidate. Hayden won and the Democrats thereby took over control of the majority of the Senate.

Cloture Struggle: The "liberal" assault on Rule 22 (which specifies a two-thirds vote of the Senate to end debate) involved the left-wing in its most violent series of flip-flops in recent years — according to press gallery observers on the Hill. In their drive to disarm the South, the Senate's ADA faction reversed themselves on at least four counts:

- While they have vigorously defended "the rights of the minority" and "freedom of speech" for Communists and pro-Communists, they ignored both in this contest by exalting the will of the majority as the supreme — and only — good.

- They have frequently wielded the filibuster themselves. Indeed, the record for filibusters (22 hours and 26 minutes) is held by one of the most extreme left-wingers in the Senate — Oregon's Wayne Morse.

- When they ground out the censure of Senator McCarthy in 1954, they enthusiastically endorsed the idea that the Senate was a "continuing body" — so that the Senator could be "punished" for alleged misdeeds of a previous session. In order to abolish Rule 22, they flopped over last week and maintained the opposite: that the Senate is *not* a continuing body.

- They have enthusiastically supported the United Nations voting procedure which gives a minority of one — usually the Soviet Union — the power to stop all action by casting a veto. The veto power, it is said, is a "right" of the Soviet Union. Yet the "liberals" would deny a less potent version of that same right to 32 Senators of the United States.

Watch Education: Veteran observers yesterday saw a portent in the little-noticed fact that the very first bill of the new Congress was a measure which called for a whopping outlay of $3 billion to help build public schools. This bill was arbitrarily assigned the top spot as "H.R. 1" among hundreds of other bills simultaneously introduced on the first day. That does not *per se* give the bill priority over other measures in the Congressional machinery of action, but House leaders generally reserve the first bill number for legislation to which they attach special importance.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Conservative Republican: Representative Lawrence Smith (R.-Wis.), veteran of eight terms in the House of Representatives, returned this week, flushed with an overwhelming victory in the November election. Yet Representative Smith is not a "modern Republican," nor a "liberal," but avowedly a conservative in his policy, with a long record of conservative voting in Congress. He represents a district in Southern Wisconsin which is about 65 per cent urban, 35 per cent rural. Some of the heaviest concentrations of factories in the state (the Racine-Kenosha-Janesville-Beloit area) are in his district, with a strong labor union organization — mostly Reuther's UAW. His district and his political problems are perhaps typical of many constituencies in the Middle West, where quite a few are part industrial, part agricultural.

In his campaign Smith differed definitely — but respectfully — with President Eisenhower on some major issues, but agreed with him as strongly on others. He opposed Ike's foreign aid requests and his Federal Aid to Education measure. He was also for the Bricker Amendment, anathema to the White House. On the other hand, Smith backed Ike's "flexible support" agricultural policy, a touchy issue in a big butter and cheese state. He believes and frankly said that the solution of the farm problem was to get the Government off the farmer's back and get farm supports off the taxpayer's back. Apparently, his farm constituents liked his attitude for he pulled a bigger vote in these precincts than he did two years ago.

But, the big feature of his campaign for reelection was the unprecedented magnitude of labor union efforts to unseat him. Far more money, far more organization activity went into the battle of union bosses than ever before (and these elements have traditionally been opposed to Smith). The Congressman believes that this high-powered drive reacted against his Democratic, UAW-backed opponent. He is certain that many conservative and moderate Democrats turned and voted for him, in disgust at the lavish spending and pressure of the labor bosses' fight to unseat him.

This conservative trend was strikingly illustrated in the Ninth Wisconsin District, long dominated by New Dealish ideas, formerly under long-time Representative Merlin Hull, then after his death three years ago under Democratic Congressman Lester Johnson. A young conservative Republican challenged Johnson in November and the Democrat won, but with a very reduced margin — his majority dropping from about 30,000 to about 3,000.

As for Representative Lawrence Smith, he won by a majority twice as large as two years ago, and percentage-wise larger than four years ago in the Presidential election. He doubts that Ike's victory last November had any influence on the Congressional result in his own constituency. Surveying the outcome in House contests, Smith believes conservative GOP members made a better showing than "liberal" GOP candidates because of their support of conservative policies. "Coattail riding" did not contribute to the Republican victory, as he sees it. He finds no mandate for a shift of the Party to "modern Republicanism." This Representative is rather typical of scores of others in the House, whose influence will be felt as the session proceeds.

Refugees: A realistic estimate of Congressional tempers is that the Administration will be given virtual *carte blanche*, as it desires, to bring into this country additional refugees from blood-bathed Hungary.

But any similar request for authority to bring in refugees from Red terrorism in other countries will be subjected to much more searching inquiry and may be rejected.

The admiration and sympathy for the valiant Hungarian freedom fighters is unbounded, and even those who fear that the Reds probably have a certain number of secret agents "planted" in the refugee ranks will not complain too much about the Administration requests in this regard.

But Vice President Nixon, in his report on his pre-Christmas trip to Vienna and to Austrian refugee camps, recommended statutory provision for admission of "additional numbers of Hungarian and other refugees from Communist persecution." The latter phrase is raising many Capital eyebrows.

Supporters of the bitterly controversial McCarran-Walter immigration law fear that this recommendation will be used by lefties as a wedge to achieve what they never have been able to accomplish directly — destruction of the law's national

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

origins quota system. They are preparing to do battle in defense of that system, as they have done successfully each time the issue has arisen on its own merits.

Actually, they feel the Hungarian situation has proved that despite the carping attacks of "liberals," the McCarran-Walter law is sufficiently flexible to cover any emergency situation. The 20,000-plus Hungarian refugees already in this country were brought in under the law's emergency "parole" provision, whereby immigrants can be brought in first, then subjected to full security investigation after they are here. That, these supporters say, is sufficient to cover any emergency.

Foreign Investments: An international Magna Charta to protect private investments around the world looms as a project to which members of Congress may give attention in the session just commencing. Financial experts on Capitol Hill perceive in this idea a valuable weapon in fortifying free enterprise and thereby strengthening the free world in its conflict with international communism. It is expected that this subject will be given an airing under the GOP Administration such as it never was able to get under the New and Fair Deals.

The damage inflicted on the confidence of international investors by confiscation of assets, nationalization and other similar moves by various states in the world has inspired much discussion in Washington as to means by which to check such trends. Now, a proposed solution comes from Germany, where powerful financial figures have formed the "Society for Promotion of the Protection of Foreign Investment." The new group is dedicated to work for an international agreement that will provide firm and binding safeguards for the property rights of private foreign investors. The project would establish a covenant under which participating nations would guarantee private foreign investors against loss through confiscation or expropriation, ensuring compensation to foreign owners of property in the event of nationalization of their holdings. The Society would also create arbitration machinery to deal with disputes relating to foreign-owned private property.

This organization enjoys a veritable powerhouse of prestige in the person of Herr Herman J. Abs, West Germany's leading banker and financial adviser to Chancellor Adenauer. Abs met with State Department officials in Washington in 1953 to discuss the return of German assets. This German banker does not think merely in terms of pious declarations in favor of foreign investment. Not long ago, he was reported as suggesting an international agreement "binding the participants to retaliate by economic and, if necessary, political sanctions against any violation of foreign property."

Quite evidently, as a writer in the London *Financial Times* pointed out, the German experiment is based on the idea that debtor countries would be much less inclined to yield to the temptation to enrich themselves by taking over foreign assets if they were made to realize that such action would bring them under pressure from other directions — for example through interruption of the flow of money from all capital exporting countries.

It is pointed out that nothing has been more effective since the war in encouraging defaulting countries to reach a settlement of their indebtedness abroad on Government bonds than the realization that they would not obtain a single dollar from the World Bank until they had demonstrated that they were doing something to end such defaults.

Letter from JOHN JOHNSTON, Chief Editorial Writer, *Chicago Daily News:* "I consider HUMAN EVENTS an honest, penetrating and challenging presentation of a point of view that sorely needs effective expression."

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION to HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1.

Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3.

By first class mail, $12 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $14 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $13 a year; airmail, $18.

Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address.

Bound Annual Volume with complete Index $15. Only 1955 and 1956 Volumes are available.

The Declaration of Independence opens: "When in the course of HUMAN EVENTS . . ."

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher*
JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Contributing Editors: FRANK CHODOROV, M. STANTON EVANS

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1957.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XIV, No. 1 HUMAN EVENTS January 5, 1957

Article Section

INSIDE THE STATE DEPARTMENT

A discussion of Big Government based on the book *Inside the State Department* by Bryton Barron, a former Department official retired after 26 years of service.

Published by The Comet Press.
Available from Communication Services, Room 505, 100 W. 42nd St., New York 36, N. Y. $3.

by FRANK CHODOROV

HARDLY a day passes but what the State Department achieves front page headlines. Sometimes what the Secretary says is given more prominence than a speech by the President, while a meeting of an Under Secretary with his foreign opposite is held to be more newsworthy than a session of Congress. In a way, this emphasis is justified; since our internal affairs are greatly influenced by our involvement in the affairs of other nations, what the State Department says, does or plans to do is of prime importance to all of us, and editors are under obligation to put first things first.

Along with prominence has come size. During the past three decades, or since foreign involvement became a national policy, the Department's once minuscule staff (it consisted of 24 operatives in Lincoln's time) has grown into an army of 30,000 men and women, spread all over the globe. Of these, about 7,000 at the home base will soon occupy a $56 million edifice, the largest in the District of Columbia. Only the military branches consume more of our taxes.

"The State Department," says Bryton Barron in his recently published book, *Inside the State Department,* "is no longer a mere Government bureau. It has become a free-wheeling, almost independent branch of Government, a petty sovereign state, far closer in spirit to the chancelleries abroad than the grass roots of America."

One would assume — or at least hope — that so important a branch of our political establishment is manned by men of integrity and an unquestionable devotion to the welfare of the country. That is the least to be expected of it. From the amount of verbiage in the public press devoted to the affairs of the Department it is fair to conclude that editors do hold its personnel in some respect and that the reading public entertains a similar opinion.

It comes therefore as a shock to read testimony to the contrary, especially when it is offered by one who has spent 26 years in the Department, as Chief of the Publishing Section, Assistant Chief of the Division of Research and Publication, head of the Treaty Staff, foreign policy analyst and historian. When he asserts that the main interest of the workers in the Department is to maintain or better their jobs, to make work for themselves, to "sell" themselves to higher-ups and to get more money from Congress, he speaks from experience. Perhaps Mr. Barron is a prejudiced witness, since his leaving the Department was attended with some unpleasantness; as a historian, assigned to the job of preparing for publication the Department's papers relative to the Yalta and Teheran meetings, he insisted that all the papers be made available to the public and to professional historians, while his policy-minded confreres demanded omissions and emendations, and out of this controversy came his resignation. Yet, there is much in his evidence that is irrefutable, like quotations from official papers, dates and names; and some of his statements, if they were not true, would come near laying him open to libel charges.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1957 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Granting that many in the Department are devoted to their work, and loyal to the American tradition, there are others, says Mr. Barron, "in posts of influence," who may be described as:

"eager one-worlders and international socialists;

"bureaucrats who have developed a contempt for the man on the street and a disdain for the men on Capitol Hill;

"left-wingers and former Communists;

"Officials who are indebted to former administrations;

"officers who, while abroad, lost touch with the homeland;

"men of foreign birth, raised and educated abroad;

"political hacks who know little of foreign affairs;

"personal favorites of top officials;

"and the Alger Hiss type."

The book is largely devoted to the theme that there is more than a sprinkling of such characters in the Department, and that they wield much influence in the shaping of our foreign policy. One long chapter is given to the Hiss case, not to repeat what is common knowledge but to show how a man of that type and persuasion can work his way into the top echelons of government. Hiss is merely a symbol.

THE PICTURE painted by Mr. Barron recalls the pledge in the Republican party platform of 1952: "We shall eliminate from the State Department and from every Federal office all, wherever they may be found, who share responsibility for the needless predicaments and perils in which we find ourselves." This was the promise to clean up the "mess in Washington" that played a big part in Mr. Eisenhower's first campaign. Four years later, according to Mr. Barron, we find the State Department doing business at the same old stand in the same old way. Many of the doubtful characters in the Acheson regime are holding down the same or even more influential positions, and the operating cliques continue their conspiratorial purposes. That is, the "mess" is a continuing Washington institution.

Was the Republican party in 1952 spoofing the electorate? Was Mr. Eisenhower indulging in "campaign oratory"? Why did he not, on taking office, clean out the "Hordes of Loafers, Incompetents and Unnecessary Employees"? (This is a chapter title in Mr. Barron's book.) Because no President, even if he had a mind to, could possibly clean up the State Department or any other Federal bureaucracy. There are barriers that cannot be penetrated.

Early in the first Eisenhower term a series of investigations were held for the purpose of ascertaining who ought to be dropped from the Federal payroll. As a result, a number of "undesirables" were dismissed and the Administration, with pride of accomplishment, issued figures, not names; the Democrats in Congress vigorously attacked these figures as inaccurate, and denounced the implication that the discharged individuals were subversive — which reflected unfavorably on the loyalty of the ousted Democratic regime. The "liberal" press raised a howl about "civil liberties," to the great discomfort of the Republicans, who had committed themselves to winning over the "pinks" and "intellectuals" segment of the electorate.

The whole thing was a tempest in a teapot. Those who were discharged were replaced by others who, regardless of the characters and capacities they brought with them, had to fit themselves into the pattern of bureaucracy in order to stay. No jobs were abolished. Congress showed no inclination to abolish them, for it made appropriations for their continuance. After all, patronage is an important factor in political life, regardless of party.

Could Mr. Eisenhower, if he wanted to, put through a bill discontinuing out of hand a dozen or so branches of the State Department, thus automatically dropping from the payroll some thousands of "loafers, incompetents and unnecessary employees"? Would Congress consider an arbitrary cut of, say, 50 per cent of the amount of money given the Department in the previous year? The "mess in Washington" will never be cleaned up any other way.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Barron points out that the State Department now resembles a foreign chancellery. He could say as much for every Washington bureau. The bigger the Government becomes, the more interventions and functions it undertakes, the greater the importance of the petty functionaries to whom the operational details must be entrusted. The best the head of Government can do is to enunciate a policy; the best the Legislative branch can do is to place its approval on the policy. From that point on the policy is in the hands of the bureaucrats, and what they do with it is a matter of conscience.

We can rest assured that, men being what they are, the policy will be so executed as to redound to the benefit of the bureaucrats — in the perpetuation of their jobs, the improvement of their perquisites and the enlargement of their honorifics. And, if there happens to be a Hiss in their midst, a clever fellow with a sense of mission, would he not bend the policy to his purpose? After all, a policy is only a generality that needs constant interpretation and those who interpret it hold the winning hand. Can it be otherwise?

But, does the President really make policy, singlehanded? One who undertakes to chart the course of a business ought to be familiar with its over-all problems, in production, marketing, financing and labor. Experience in the line, or a similar line, is essential. And, in the final analysis, his judgment is always guided by the needs of the market and by competition; the customer sets the policy.

This is not true of the biggest business of the world, the Government of the United States. To become President one must have political, not business, sagacity, and in making policy there is no market to direct him in its management. The consumer in this case is the voter, who is compelled to take what he gets in the way of Government service until the next election, when he might have some say in how the business, of which he knows nothing, should be run.

And the business is so complicated and vast that it would take near omniscience to grasp all its problems, let alone provide solutions. For a man to set policy for the Government he would have to understand, for instance, the economic as well as the political consequences of foreign aid, the intricacies of social security "insurance," the electric power business, the aims and methods of education, constitutional history and agricultural economics, the canons of taxation and the principles of banking, the art of making war and the art of law enforcement, something about geopolitics and something about soil erosion, and all about the psychology of the traitor among his two and a half million employees. God has not yet made a man of such capacity.

Under the circumstances, the best the human in the White House can do is to hope that among his entourage — all political appointees in the first place — there are men whose expert knowledge in the multitudinous fields embraced by Government will be able to help him shape a policy, something that will at least satisfy the voters that the Government is doing a good job. His instinct and his wisdom may contribute something to the policy which emerges from his consultations with these bureaucrats. But, his judgment is necessarily a reflection of what they put into his mind. And what they put into his mind is a reflection not only of their knowledge and experience but also of the interest they have in their jobs.

Even so, the President cannot consult with all the head bureaucrats of his business — there are too many of them — and he is reduced to consulting with his immediate entourage, the Palace Guard, through whose wisdom the accumulated advice of his experts has been sifted. It is upon the shoulders of this small group that he must lean in shaping the policy he finally enunciates. It is their policy, not his; he simply takes the responsibility for it. In shaping the policy they present to him they would be more than human if they were not influenced by personal and political considerations.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

After the policy has been mouthed by the President it goes to Congress for implementation. They have to consider it, vote for or against it, enact laws and pass appropriations. Do they understand what they are voting for? Are they, as individuals, any more familiar with the intricacies of Government than he?

Last year, Congress passed 1,750 bills. If a Congressman had nothing else to do (like peppering his constituents with reasons why he should be returned to office) would he be able to read, let alone decipher, that number of bills in one session? There are not enough hours in the day for such a chore. He is not a superman, physically or intellectually. So, his decisions must be determined by those who read the bills. Who reads them? First, who writes them? They are written by bureaucrats skilled in writing laws. And they are interpreted for the harassed Congressman by other bureaucrats, probably those who have a personal interest in the proposed laws. It is they who prepare "digests" of the bills, furnish arguments for or against them, provide estimates for the costs involved, and altogether do the thinking for the representative of the people. If a speech favoring or opposing the bill is needed, they write it.

The most important bill voted each year by Congress is the budget. It is an imposing volume, its pages bespattered with figures. It is unreadable and, of course, unread. But, how and by whom is it compiled? By bureaucrats, to be sure. Each of the myriad departments of Government presents an estimate of its needs for the coming year and each, of course, is quite liberal in arriving at the figure. Knowing that it is customary for Congress (to establish a reputation for safeguarding the public purse) to make a percentage cut of the proposed budget, the bureaucrats make the proper allowance; sometimes the allowance is greater than the cut and the department finds itself with more money than it can spend. At any rate, it is a certainty that no Congressman knows what he is voting for when he votes for the budget. He can't. And yet, the budget is the essence of the policy enunciated by the President.

THIS is not to be construed as a criticism of the President or of Congress. It is a realistic appraisal of the kind of establishment inherent in Big Government. Human beings being what they are, it is simply impossible for elected officials, drawn from all walks of life, to understand or supervise its multitudinous and intricate undertakings. Even an overall picture of the machine is beyond the comprehension of any one man. Under these circumstances, the clerks and functionaries who devote all their time to particular phases of the Government assume importance in the management of affairs, and the higher clerks and functionaries achieve a measure of autonomy. Sometimes they work themselves into a status of indispensability.

Thus, the kind of Government that Big Government brings about is an oligarchy of bureaucrats. That is what Mr. Barron means when he speaks of foreign chancelleries. It makes no difference to the "civil servants" of England or France who the ostensible head of Government is, what party controls the cabinet, what policies are debated in the legislative bodies. They carry on regardless of the political furor. And they carry on with an eye to their personal interests and predilections.

That is what we are coming to in this country — Government by an entrenched bureaucracy. Given Big Government, nothing else is possible.

Additional copies of this 4-page Article: single copy 20¢ (coins, not stamps); 10 copies $1; 25 copies $2; 100 copies $5; 500 copies $20; 1,000 copies $30. In 5,000 lots $22 per thousand. News section sold separately — at same rates. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery, add one cent a copy, for airmail, add two cents a copy.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $10 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED